

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1 through 8 were pending in the Application.

The prior rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first and second paragraphs, were withdrawn. The rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,505,237 to Beyda et al (Beyda) was reiterated. Applicants traverse the rejection below.

I. Traversal of the Rejections over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 - 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,505,237 to Beyda et al (Beyda). Applicants traverse this rejection below.

A. The Present Invention

The present invention provides a technique for handling the off-loading of content from a document to a repository in a document processing system. A document in the system is copied to a remote repository. The document in the system is then stripped down to a stub document containing at least enough information to permit a user to identify the document as well as a link to the copy in the repository. If a user wants to view the document, the copy is retrieved from the repository, and the original document is recreated in the document processing system. This technique is effective in reducing the storage requirements of the document processing system itself by providing enhanced usage of a

separate remote storage system.

B. Differences between the Claims and Beyda

Beyda is directed to the handling and management of files attached to messages. When an electronic message is downloaded by a user from a server, only the attached files that meet a prescribed requirement are automatically downloaded. The prescribed requirement can depend on the personal preference of the user. When a user forwards the message, only those files that have been modified are uploaded from the client device to the server.

The Beyda system is clearly different from the present invention. Beyda is directed to the configuration of client devices. The client devices are configured so that an attachment to an email is not downloaded. When a user tries to download electronic messages from a server, based some predetermined condition, only certain attachments are automatically downloaded. This is not at all like the present invention.

Claim 1 recites "stripping content from the original document in the document processing system to form a stub document, the stub containing at least information to enable automatic retrieval of the stored document from the repository when the stub document is selected by a user". Relative to this subject matter, the Office Action cites Column 4, line 63, which states that "the client devices 14, 16 and 18 may be configured to download only the email message and not the attached file from the local router/server12." There is no discussion of stripping content to form a stub document. Rather, if a client device is so configured, only an email message, and not the attachment, is downloaded. There is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure of forming a stub which contains

information to enable automatic retrieval of a stored document upon selection of the stub by a user. The cited passage only discusses configuring client devices to download only an email message and not a file attached to the email. These appears to be the somewhat the opposite of the claimed subject matter. The claimed subject matter creates a stub document, from which content has been stripped, which can retrieve the original stored document from a repository. Beyda downloads only 'the email message' and not the attached file from a local router/server 12. There is no discussion of the 'email message' itself being able to or containing information which can be utilized to retrieve a stored document from a repository. The cited portion of Beyda only discusses how a client is configured so that only 'the email message', rather than the email message and an attached file, is downloaded. The present subject matter has nothing to do with configuring clients.

Claim 1 also recites "maintaining the stub document in the document processing system." Relative to this subject matter, the client devices 14, 16 and 18 from Beyda are cited, apparently since the email message (without attachments) is downloaded to the client devices from the local router/server 12. There is still no discussion as to how the email message is able to retrieve an original stored message from a repository. Also, it is unclear what in Beyda represents the repository and what represents the document processing system. Is the Office Action arguing that the client is a document processing system and the server is a repository? Is the server 12 employed in the Office Action to disclose both the repository and part of the document processing system? Claim 1 recites "handling content off-loading from documents in a document processing system to a repository". In Claim 1, the original document originally resides in the document processing system in Claim 1, at which the content is stripped. In Beyda, no 'stripping' occurs at the client. Rather, Beyda simply downloads only an email message and not attached files. No content is stripped out. No original document from a document processing system is stored in a repository.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Beyda does not teach, suggest or

Serial No. 10/015,302

4

Docket DE920000113US1

disclose the subject matter of independent Claim 1. Independent Claims 6 and 8 were apparently rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1. Based on these arguments, Applicants submit that independent Claims 6 and 8 also patentably distinguish over Beyda. While it follows that the dependent claims also patentably distinguish over Beyda, further differences between some of the dependent claims and independent Claim 8 and Beyda are discussed below.

Claims 4, 7 and 8 recite similar subject matter. Using Claim 4 for exemplary purposes, Claim 4 recites "retrieving the stored document from the repository when a user attempts to open the stub document; and inserting content into the stub document from the stored document to restore the original document." Relative to this subject matter, a passage from Column 5, line 44 is cited. This has nothing to do with the subject matter from Claims 4 and 8 cited above. This passage has to do with the forwarding of a received email with an attached file, and states that the "receiving party then commands the client device 14 to forward an email message to the sender." There is no discussion of retrieving a stored document from a repository. There is no discussion of retrieving a stored document from a repository when a user attempts to open a stub document. Beyda does not discuss inserting content into the stub document. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 4, 7 and 8 further distinguish over Beyda.

Dependent Claim 5 recites "said stripping step preserves a unique document identifier in the stub document to keep a link to the stored document valid." Nothing from Beyda is cited relative to this subject matter. Beyda provides no description of the 'stripped' document other than that it contains the email message and not the attached files. There is no discussion of preserving a unique document identifier in a stub document. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 5 further distinguishes over Beyda.

II. Summary

Applicants have presented technical explanations and arguments fully supporting their position that the pending claims contain subject matter which is not taught, suggested or disclosed by Beyda. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present Application is in a condition for Allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory M. Doudnikoff
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 32,847

GMD/ssc

Docket No: DE920000113US1
PHONE: 919-254-1288 FAX: 919-254-4330

Serial No. 10/015,302

6

Docket DE920000113US1